



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,828	07/14/2003	Ajay Kumar	5681-15100	5939
58467	7590	02/03/2009	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] EXAMINER TRUONG, CAMQUY
MHKKG/SUN			[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] ART UNIT 2195
P.O. BOX 398				[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER PAPER
AUSTIN, TX 78767				
			[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] MAIL DATE 02/03/2009
				[REDACTED] DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/618,828	KUMAR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	CAMQUY TRUONG	2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 30 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-36 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-56 of copending Application No. 10/618,810.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The examiner can ascertain no difference between the claims of the present application and that of copending Application No. 10/342, 432. It is noted that the minor difference encompass replacement of the recitation of the limitations in the claims and it appears to be substantially the same or duplicate or in some instance obvious over one another. For example, claims 1, 14, 15, and 26, functions performed

by the steps are the same and obvious as the steps of claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 30, 39, and 48 of copending Application No. 10/618,810.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. The specification is objected to for potential 101 problem as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d) (1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Appropriate correction is required because the specification does not provide antecedent basis for "computer-accessible storage medium" as recited in line 1 of claim 7.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 15-25 recite a method comprising steps that may be performed mentally and / or manually by human being. Thus, the method neither explicitly recites another statutory class of invention (i.e., a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter)

nor inherently requires the use of a particular machine or apparatus. Accordingly, the recited invention is nonstatutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-19, 25-30, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mckee et al. (5,488, 694) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. 2001/0037315) and further in view of Demers et al. (U.S. 5,781, 912).

6. As to claim 1, Mckee teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a system, comprising:

one or more processors (I/O processors, col. 4, lines 34-37);  
pause the plurality of transactions managed by the transaction manager in response to a pause request to pause the transaction manager ( the transaction queue is capable of being frozen in response to <que\_FRZ> , col. 20, lines 26-28 / Abnormal termination of an IOC transaction causes the transaction queue 806 to be frozen and the que.sub.-- FRZ flag in the queue manager CSR 802 to be set, col.23, line 65 –

col.24, line 3), wherein while paused, the transaction manager does not allow any of the plurality of transactions managed by the transaction manager to complete ( so that all entries that have not been selected will not be executed, col. 20, lines 28-30); and resume the plurality of transactions managed by the transaction manager in response to a resume request (unfreezing the transaction queue using the same mechanism as frozen such as in response to signal, col. 20, lines 30-32).

7. Mckee does not explicitly teach memory coupled to the one or more processors and configured to store program instructions executable by the one or more processors to implement a transaction manager, wherein the transaction manager is configured to:

manage a plurality of transactions initiated by one or more application, wherein each transaction comprises a plurality of operations to one or more data sources that are required to be committed to the one or more data sources atomically for each respective transaction.

8. However, Saliba teaches memory coupled to the one or more processors and configured to store program instructions executable by the one or more processors to implement a transaction manager (storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of executable instructions including at least a subset of which that, when executed, implement the financial transaction manager, paragraphs 37, and 117), wherein the transaction manager is configured to:

manage a plurality of transactions initiated by one or more application (email client application executing on the computing device to access and interact with the email system 102, paragraph 40 / email server application 115 implements a number of common email services such as, for example, compose email, send email, receive email, display email, and the a like, Paragraph 42 / initiate payments, request payments, authorize payments and perform a number of account maintenance and management functions through an email user interface, paragraph 43), wherein each transaction (Request a Payment) comprises a plurality of operations to one or more data sources that are required to be committed to the one or more data sources a atomically for each respective transaction ( select, identify...and submit, paragraphs 94-97).

9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mckee to incorporate the teaching of memory coupled to the one or more processors and configured to store program instructions executable by the one or more processors to implement a transaction manager, wherein the transaction manager is configured to manage a plurality of transactions initiated by one or more application, wherein each transaction comprises a plurality of operations to one or more data sources that are required to be committed to the one or more data sources a atomically for each respective transaction as taught by Saliba because this allow to enable users to access and utilize the features of email system to complete their purpose.

10. Mckee and Saliba do not explicitly teach committed to source atomically. However, Hallmark teaches committed to source atomically (transaction that can update any number of the distributed database and can commit the transaction atomically, col. 2, line 59- col. 3, line 3).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Mckee and Saliba to incorporate the teaching of committed to source atomically as taught by Hallmark because it allow to prevent other transactions from altering the data at inappropriate times during processing.

12. As to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

13. As to claim 2, Mckee teaches the transaction manager is configured to change the state of each of the plurality of transaction managed by the transaction manager (Completed status means that a completed request is no longer using the IOC bus 110 and the status word has been written into the transaction buffer 670, col. 17, lines 5-22).

14. As to claims 3-4, Saliba teaches the transaction manager is configured to request permission to change the state of each of the plurality of transactions managed by the transaction manager prior to changing the state of each respective transaction (the

status for a particular financial transaction changes, the change is displayed in the Inbox, paragraph 86).

15. As to claim 5, Mckee teaches the transaction manager is configured to prohibit a change of state of each of the plurality of transactions managed by the transaction manager while the transaction manager is paused complete (so that all entries that have not been selected will not be executed, col. 20, lines 28-30; thereby, changing the state of transaction is prohibit).

16. As to claims 6-7, Mckee teaches the transaction manager is configured to support the execution of each of the plurality of transactions managed by the transaction manager within a respective current state while the transaction manager is paused (freeing up the transaction controller to process another request, col. 17, lines 20-22).

17. As to claim 8, Mckee teaches while the transaction manager is paused, the system is configured to perform operations on one or more individual transactions (freeing up the transaction controller to process another request, col. 17, lines 20-22).

18. As to claim 9, Saliba teaches the operations comprise one or more from the following: rollback, abort, partial rollback, add/remove participant, and commit (submit, paragraph 97).

19. As to claims 10, 12-13, Hallmark teaches one or more of the transactions are local and global transactions (local/global transaction, col. 4, lines 14-25).

20. As to claim 11, McKee teaches while paused, the transaction manager is not allowed to change the state of the one or more transactions to the committing state (so that all entries that have not been selected will not be executed, col. 20, lines 28-30).

20. As to claims 15, and 26, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

22. As to claims 16 and 27, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 11. In addition, Saliba teaches the transaction manager attempts to perform a state change on a transaction in response to input to the transaction manager (the status for a particular financial transaction changes, the change is displayed in the Inbox, paragraph 86).

22. As to claim 17 and 28, Saliba teaches the input comprise notification that an application has initiated a transaction (responsive to user input received via the email application/user interface 115 to selectively invoke services of the financial manager suite 304, paragraph 63).

23. As to claims 18 and 29, Saliba teaches state change comprises a change from a nonexistent state to an active state (status for a particular financial transaction changes, the change is displayed in the Inbox, paragraph 86).

24. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 7.
25. As to claims 19, and 30, Saliba teaches input comprises notification that an application has executed a commit transaction command (submit the request by selection of the submit soft-key 932, step 822. In response, the management function 316 forwards the message to an appropriate technical resource, which responds to the user's request, paragraph 93).
26. As to claim 36, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 25.
27. **Claims 20-24, 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mckee et al. (5,488, 694) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. 2001/0037315) and further in view of Demers et al. (U.S. 5,781, 912), as applied to claims 19, and 30 above, and further in view of Klein et al. (U.S. Patent 6,728,958 B1).**
28. As to claims 20-21, and 31-32, Mckee, Saliba and Demers do not explicitly teach teaches notification that all participants are prepared commit the transaction. However, Klein teaches notification that all participants are prepared commit the transaction (col. 2, lines 32-36, and lines 53-67).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of McKee and Saliba to incorporate the teaching of notification that all participants are prepared commit the transaction as taught Klein because this allows transactions to be performed simultaneously as desired for optimal system performance.

30. As to claims 22-23, and 33-34, Klein teaches a change from a preparing state to a committing state (col. 2, lines 14-23).

31. As to claims 24 and 35, Saliba teaches state change comprises a change from a nonexistent state to an active state (status for a particular financial transaction changes, the change is displayed in the Inbox, paragraph 86).

### ***Conclusion***

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAMQUY TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng Ai An can be reached on (703)305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

Camquy Truong  
January 30 2009